

8 SEP 1978

NOTE FOR: Deputy Director for Administration

STATINTL FROM: [REDACTED]
Acting Director of Logistics

Jack:

STATINTL 1. [REDACTED] of OLC telephoned RECD on 7 September to advise of a call from a Mr. Fellenbaum (phonetic), senior staff officer of the Senate Appropriations Committee, re the prospectus avoidance of 85,000 square feet of additional space. Per Mr. Fellenbaum, the similar process used with SAFE was considered as a one-time exercise and had been difficult to push through the staff of the Public Works Committees. He apparently was substantially less than enthusiastic about this latest action. He asked for answers to the following questions:

- Q. If the acquisition had been delayed since 1975, why had we not started prospectus then?
- A. At the time the request was submitted, we were beneath prospectus limits.
- Q. When was the freeze of space acquisition listed?
- A. Sometime prior to the date our letter to GSA was submitted (circa July 1978). Agency personnel noticed GSA space ads in the newspaper.
- Q. Why does it take 18 months to 3 years for a prospectus?
- A. These are the numbers given by GSA. (Note here that we did not specify in the letter to the committees the specific time frame for prospectus. It is reported by GSA that 12 to 18 months is an optimistic estimate. The three-year time frame cited in question includes time required for acquisition, alteration, and occupancy.)

Q. What is the impact if a three-year delay is involved?

A. Undoubtedly, major, although technical offices should respond because the delay will involve postponement of SAFE/ADSTAR, etc. Note here that a more formal response should avoid tying necessity exclusively to SAFE/ADSTAR, which represents less than half of the requirement. The response should dwell most heavily on current space utilization ratios [redacted] compared to Federal averages (171 sq. ft. per person). These statistics should be tied to loss of flexibility, inability to absorb NITC special committees, and the SAFE/ADSTAR et al technical systems.

STATINTL

۱۰۵

2. On 8 September, [redacted] called again to advise STATINTL that Mr. Fellenbaum desired a meeting on Monday or Tuesday and that Mr. Snodgrass of the House Appropriations Committee STATINTL wanted to be present. With this information, OL contacted [redacted] Office of the Comptroller, to alert him of the pending meeting. Discussions were held with [redacted] regarding the advisability of having technical or NFAC representatives available to discuss the SAFE/ADSTAR delay impact. The preliminary agreement was that it would be inadvisable to open the SAFE issue anew and that our case should rest on the position noted in the last question of the previous paragraph.

3. It is believed that a key issue in the pending meeting may be the legal necessity of Public Works review of Agency appropriations as well as the political considerations of additional oversight of Agency activities. Accordingly, it is recommended that an OGC representative also attend the meeting.

STATINTL